Application No. 10/562,385 Paper Dated: March 20, 2008

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of December 21, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 0388-052976

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 5. This sheet, which includes Figs. 3, 4, and 5, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 3, 4, and 5.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Application No. 10/562,385 Paper Dated: March 20, 2008

In Depleted: March 20, 2008

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of December 21, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 0388-052976

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the December 21, 2007 Office Action. In the Office Action, claims 5-6 stand rejected. Claims 1-4 were indicated as being allowable. Accordingly, claims 5-6 have been cancelled. A substitute Abstract has been submitted and the specification has been amended to attend to formalities. Applicants submit one Replacement Sheet (Figs. 3, 4, and 5) to label the diagram boxes 8a and 81. No new matter has been introduced by the foregoing amendments.

The Office Action has objected to the Abstract for including legal phraseology and using two paragraphs. Further, the Office Action also suggested new headings for the specification. A substitute Abstract has been submitted with this Amendment to attend to these deficiencies. The specification has also been amended to include new section headings. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to the drawings, namely Fig. 5, for lacking descriptive phrases or legends with regard to the empty diagram boxes. Fig. 5 has been amended to label the diagram boxes 8a and 81 as "chip resistor" and "amplifier circuit part", respectively. Support for this amendment is found in the specification at paragraph [0029]. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection, and approval of the revised drawings, are respectfully requested.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP 11-248737 to Koichi et al. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over JP 2001-1267588 to Hideyo et al. in view of JP 59-079700 to Katsuo. Claims 5 and 6 have been cancelled by this amendment.

Application No. 10/562,385 Paper Dated: March 20, 2008

In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of December 21, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 0388-052976

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the amendment be entered and the application be passed to allowance with claims 1-4.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

Richard L. Byrne

Registration No. 28,498 Attorney for Applicants 436 Seventh Avenue 700 Koppers Building Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Telephone: (412) 471-8815 Facsimile: (412) 471-4094

E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com